

## **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 1 is amended. Claim 28 is added. The revision to claim 1 is supported, for example, at Figure 15 and at page 40, line 10 through page 41, line 25 in the specification. New claim 28 is supported, for example, at Figure 3 and page 35, lines 10-20 in the specification. Claims 1-11 and 28 are pending, with claim 1 being the sole independent claim.

### **Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,876,451 (Ikeda). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a solid electrolytic capacitor. A base sheet member is brought into direct contact with a protection package between a first side surface and a second side surface of the protection package.

Ikeda does not teach or suggest at least these features. Ikeda is directed to a method of manufacturing solid electrolyte capacitors. However, the insulating base members disclosed in Ikeda (e.g., elements 67, 67', 76, and 76') are spaced apart from the protection package (e.g., elements 66 and 75). See, e.g., Figures 22-25. Moreover, the metallic case (e.g., elements 61 and 71) that separates the insulating base member from the protection package is necessary to connect leads of the capacitor element to the outer terminal plate. Therefore, it would not be obvious to modify Ikeda to omit the metallic case. Accordingly, Ikeda does not teach or suggest that a base sheet member is brought into direct contact with a protection package between a first side surface and a second side surface of the protection package.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference. In addition, claims 2 and 4-6 depend from claim 1, and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Ikeda in combination with U.S. Patent No. 4,497,105 (Uemura). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Uemura does not remedy the deficiencies of Ikeda as noted above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Applicant does not concede the correctness of this rejection.

Claims 2, 4-9, and 11 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 3 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Ikeda in combination with Uemura and U.S. Patent No. 4,814,946 (Su). Claim 10 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Ikeda in combination with Uemura and U.S. Patent No. 5,390,074 (Hasegawa). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.


Claims 3 and 10 both depend from claim 1, which is believed allowable for the reasons stated above. Neither Su nor Hasegawa remedies the deficiencies of Ikeda and Uemura with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that each of claims 3 and 10 is allowable over the cited references for at least the reason that it is dependent upon an allowable base claim. Applicant does not concede the correctness of these rejections.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: October 24, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300  
DPM:DTL